

REMARKS

Claim Objections

The Examiner objects to claim 21 for lacking proper antecedent basis. Claim 21 has been amended to address this issue. This objection is respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-11, 13-14, 16-20, 22-23

The Examiner rejects claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-11, 13-14, 16-20, 22-23 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. patent 5,048,026 to Shaw et al. The Applicants respectfully disagree for the reasons discussed below.

Claims 1 and 13 recite the language “said cladding diffusion-bonded to said outer surface of said core”. It appears that the Examiner is asserting that col. 2, lines 56-60 of Shaw discloses this feature. Col. 2, lines 56-60 of Shaw recite “A jacket surrounds at least a portion of this optical fiber along its length...” The Examiner’s analysis of claims 1 and 13 overlooks the fact that claims 1 and 13 recite teach that the cladding is diffusion-bonded to the outer surface of the core. Col. 2, lines 56-60 of Shaw generically teach that a jacket surrounds at least a portion of optical fiber. Shaw however, does not teach that cladding is diffusion-bonded to the outer surface of the core, as required by claims 1 and 13. It is therefore submitted that claims 1 and 13 are patentable over Shaw. Should the Examiner disagree, he is respectfully requested to clearly and specifically point out where Shaw discloses this feature in accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.104(c)2.

Claims 2, 4-8, 10-11, 14, 16-20 and 22-23 are directly or indirectly dependent on claims 1 or 13.

It is therefore submitted that claims 2, 4-8, 10-11, 14, 16-20 and 22-23 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on patentable claims 1 and 13.

Claims 3, 9, 12, 15, 21, 24

The Examiner rejects claims 3, 9, 12, 15, 21, 24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaw in view of U.S. patent 6,324,326 to Dejneka. Claims 3, 9, 12, 15, 21, 24 are all directly or indirectly dependent on claims 1 and 13, which are patentable for the reasons discussed above. It is therefore submitted that claims 3, 9, 12, 15, 21, 24 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on patentable claims 1 and 13.

Patentability of New Claims

New claims 25-26 have been added. Support for new claims 25-26 can be found at page 12, lines 14-15 of the application as originally filed. New claims 25-26 are patentable as the cited art does not disclose a cladding which envelops all of the core.

Conclusion

The Applicants respectfully submit that in light of the remarks above, all previous rejections of the claims have been overcome. Therefore, the Applicants submit that the claims are allowable over the prior art that has been cited. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account no. 12-0415. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time

period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 12-0415.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C., 20231 on:

March 19, 2003

(Date of Deposit)

Michael O. Rasmussen

(Name of Applicant, Assignee or Registered Representative)

Michael O. R

(Signature)

3/19/03

(Date)

Respectfully submitted,

Michael O. R

Michael O. Rasmussen
Agent for Applicant
Reg. No.: 52,155
LADAS & PARRY
5670 Wilshire Boulevard
Suite 2100
Los Angeles, California 90036
323-934-2300